arXiv:1611.02363v1 [math.SG] 8 Nov 2016

SYMPLECTIC NEIGHBORHOOD OF CROSSING DIVISORS

ROBERTA GUADAGNI

ABSTRACT. This paper presents a proof of the existence of standard symplectic coordinates near a set of smooth, orthogonally intersecting symplectic submanifolds. It is a generalization of the standard symplectic neighborhood theorem. Moreover, in the presence of a compact Lie group G acting symplectically, the coordinates can be chosen to be G-equivariant.

INTRODUCTION

The main result in this paper is a generalization of the symplectic tubular neighborhood theorem (and the existence of Darboux coordinates) to a set of symplectic submanifolds that intersect each other orthogonally. This can help us understand singularities in symplectic submanifolds. Orthogonally intersecting divisors (or, more generally, positively intersecting divisors as described in the appendix) are the symplectic analogue of normal crossing divisors in algebraic geometry.

The result has at least two applications to current research: it yields some intuition for the construction of generalized symplectic sums (see [TMZ14]), and it describes the symplectic geometry of degenerating families of Kähler manifolds as needed for mirror symmetry (see [GS08]). The application to toric degenerations is described in detail in [Gua16]. While the proofs are somewhat technical, the result is a natural generalization of Weinstein's neighborhood theorem.

Recall that Weinstein's symplectic neighborhood theorem [Wei71] states that, given a symplectic submanifold X of (M,ω), there exists an embedding of a neighborhood of X inside the normal bundle NX into M. Moreover, a choice of connection α on NX determines a closed 2-form ω_α, non-degenerate in a neighborhood of X, such that the embedding can be chosen to be symplectic (see Section 2). The aim of the present work is to prove an analogous statement for a union of symplectic submanifolds $\{X_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ of (M,ω). We restrict to the case of orthogonal intersection, that is, $N(X_i\cap X_j) = NX_i \oplus^\perp NX_j$, for all i,j, at all intersection points. The result can be summarized as follows (see Corollary 6.1, and see Theorem 7.5 for the equivariance):

Theorem 1. *Let $\{X_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ be a finite family of orthogonal symplectic divisors in (M,ω). Then there exist connections α_i on NX_i and symplectic neighborhood embeddings $\phi_i : (NX_i,\omega_{\alpha_i}) \to (M,\omega)$ which are pairwise compatible.*

In the presence of a group G, the embeddings can be chosen to be equivariant with respect to the linearized action.

Compatibility can be expressed as follows: for all i,j, there are symplectic neighborhood embeddings $\phi_{ij} : (NX_{ij},\omega_{\alpha_i+\alpha_j}) \to (M,\omega)$, which factor as $\phi_{ij} = \phi_i\circ\xi^i_{ij} = \phi_j\circ\xi^j_{ij}$, where $\xi^i_{ij} : NX_{ij} \cong NX_i\oplus NX_j \to NX_i$ and $\xi^j_{ij} : NX_{ij} \cong NX_i\oplus NX_j \to NX_j$ are isomorphisms of symplectic bundles (here $X_{ij} = X_i\cap X_j$).



FIGURE 1. The compatibility of ϕ_i, ϕ_j is given by the existence of $\phi_{ij}, \xi^i_{ij}, \xi^j_{ij}$.

The result can be expressed in terms of the auxiliary construction of a symplectic plumbing. A plumbing is an appropriate gluing of the normal bundles NX_i for all i, and if we keep track of some extra data we can make sure it inherits a symplectic form. The content of Theorem 6.1 and Theorem 7.5 can be summarized as follows:

Theorem 2 (reformulation of Theorem 1)**.** *Given a family of orthogonally intersecting submanifolds $\{X_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$, there exists a symplectic plumbing. The union $\bigcup_i X_i$ admits a neighborhood which is symplectomorphic to a neighborhood of the zero section in the plumbing.*

In the presence of a G-action, the plumbing inherits a linearized G-action and the symplectomorphism can be chosen to be equivariant.

Theorem 1 is then a corollary of this.

Outline of proof. For symplectic submanifolds $\{X_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$, $X_i \subset (M,\omega)$, the symplectic form ω on a neighborhood of $\bigcup_i X_i$ only depends on the restriction of ω to $TM|_{\bigcup_i X_i}$. This is the content of Lemma 1. It is a generalization of the case of one divisor, and it is done by induction.

The rest of the paper gives an explicit construction of a local model for such a symplectic form. This is done in Theorem 6.1. The strategy is to first construct an appropriate space containing $\bigcup_i X_i$ which is diffeomorphic to a neighborhood of $\bigcup_i X_i$ in M. This can be done by constructing a plumbing, that is, an appropriate union of the normal bundles NX_i for all i. Unfortunally, the construction doesn't run as smoothly when introducing symplectic structures. Therefore, we give a definition of plumbing which is more rigid than usual and requires some extra data (see Definition 6). This set of rigid data is needed in order to control the symplectic form. The fact that such data exist is stated in Theorem 4.2. We then show that a plumbing (as in Definition 6) admits a canonical symplectic form, which only depends on the symplectic bundle structure of each NX_i (together with a choice of compatible connections). This is the content of Lemma 9. The fact that one can always find connections which have the right compatibility is proven in Lemmas 7-8.

The main theorem (Theorem 6.1) states that such symplectic plumbing, which can be constructed for any choice of orthogonal symplectic submanifolds, can always be symplectically embedded into M. This proves that the space we constructed is a local model for a neighborhood of these submanifolds. The proof follows the outline of the proof of the symplectic neighborhood theorem: first, construct a smooth embedding of the plumbing (see Proposition 4.1), whose derivative is the identity along each X_i; then, apply

Lemma 1 to make it a symplectomorphism. The case of multiple submanifolds requires much more care, due to the compatibility requirements (basically, we're trying to run the symplectic neighborhood theorem on all X_i's simultaneously).

The last section of the paper extends the results in the presence of a compact Lie group acting symplectically. When such G acts on (M, ω) and preserves each submanifold X_i, we construct a G-action on the plumbing (given by linearizing the action on each NX_i). This is done in Lemma 11. Finally, in Theorem 7.5, we show that, if G acts symplectically on M, the right choice of connections makes the plumbing a symplectic G-space, and the symplectic embedding of the plumbing into M can be chosen to be equivariant.

Acknowledgments. Many thanks to Mark McLean, without whom I doubt this paper would have ever seen the light. Also thanks to Mohammad Tehrani for helpful conversation, and to Tim Perutz for his advice and patience. This work was partly supported by the NSF through grants DMS-1406418 and CAREER-1455265.

1. Symplectic forms on neighborhoods of crossing divisors

Let ω_1, ω_2 be symplectic forms on M. Let $\{X_i\}_{i\in I}$ be a collection of codimension 2 symplectic submanifolds of both (M, ω_1) and (M, ω_2). Throughout the paper we'll assume that all intersections are transverse. What follows is a version of Moser's argument for symplectic forms agreeing on transversal symplectic submanifolds.

Definition 1. *Two forms α, β on M are said to **agree along** a subset $S \subseteq M$ whenever $\alpha_x = \beta_x$ on T_xM for all $x \in S$.*

Lemma 1. *Assume that ω_1, ω_2 are symplectic forms on M that agree along $\bigcup_i X_i$. Then there exist open neighborhoods $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$ of $\bigcup_i X_i$ and a diffeomorphism $\phi : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{V}$ such that*

$$\phi|_{\bigcup_i X_i} = id \qquad \phi^*\omega_2 = \omega_1.$$

Proof. We will approach the proof by induction: for all $0 \leq k \leq n$ we'll find:

- ◇ a 2-form $\omega^{(k)}$ such that $\omega^{(k)} = \omega_1 = \omega_2$ along all X_i's, $\omega^{(k)} = \omega_1$ in a neighborhood of $\bigcup_{i=1}^k X_i$;
- ◇ f_k such that $f_k^*(\omega^{(k-1)}) = \omega^{(k)}$, $f_k = id$ on X_i for all i, and $f_k = id$ on a neighborhood of $\bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} X_i$.

The starting point will be $\omega^{(0)} = \omega_2$, and at the end $\phi = f_1 \circ \ldots \circ f_n$ will satisfy $\phi^*\omega_2 = \omega^{(n)} = \omega_1$. To construct f_k, we'll find a 1-form σ_k such that $d\sigma_k = \omega^{(k-1)} - \omega_1$ on a neighborhood of X_k, $\sigma_k = 0$ along all X_i's and $\sigma_k = 0$ on a neighborhood of $\bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} X_k$; Moser's theorem applied to σ_k yields $f_k : \mathcal{U}_k \to \mathcal{V}_k$ and $\omega^{(k)} = f_k^*(\omega^{(k-1)})$ as desired.

To construct σ_k, consider the exponential map with respect to a metric g, and let $exp_k : N_M X_k \cong T_{X_k}M^{\perp_g} \to M$ be the restriction of this map to the normal bundle of X_k (Really, we are only considering this map for vectors of length at most δ so that exp_k is a diffeomorphism. The slight abuse of notation reflects an effort to keep the notation from getting too heavy). Let $\mathcal{N}_k$ be the image of such map, i.e. a tubular neighborhood of X_k. We make sure to pick g such that exp_k restricts to a map $exp_k|_{N_{X_j}(X_k\cap X_j)} : N_{X_j}(X_k \cap X_j) \to X_j$ for all $j \neq k$ (see Lemma 2). Now define $\phi_t : \mathcal{N}_k \to \mathcal{N}_k$, the map sending $exp_k(q, v) \mapsto exp_k(q, tv)$. In particular, for all $j \neq k$, ϕ_t restricts to a map from $X_j \cap \mathcal{N}_k$ to itself.

(Notation reminder: when $(q,v) \in T^{vert}_q(M)$, $m \in M$, $exp(q,v) \in M$, then $\omega(m;v,w)$ denotes ω at the point m evaluated on $v,w \in T_m(M)$; similarly for a one form $\sigma(m;v)$ denotes σ at the point m evaluated on v.)

Now we want to consider the family of one-forms on M:

$$\sigma_t(m;v) = (\omega^{(k)} - \omega_1)(\phi_t(m); \frac{d}{dt}\phi_t(m), d\phi_t(m)v)$$

and integrate it to get

$$\tilde{\sigma}_k(m) = \int_0^1 \sigma_t(m)$$

If $m \in X_j$, then $\phi_t(m) \in X_j$. Because $(\omega_2 - \omega_1)$ vanishes on X_j, $\sigma_t(m;v) = 0$ for all v. Therefore $\tilde{\sigma}_k(m) = \int_0^1 \sigma_t(m) = 0$. Now we can extend $\tilde{\sigma}_k$ to a full neighborhood of $\bigcup_i X_i$ by letting $B_\epsilon(X_k) \subset \mathcal{N}$ be a smaller neighborhood of X_k, and define

$$\sigma_k = \begin{cases} \tilde{\sigma}_k & \text{if } x \in B_\epsilon(X_k) \\ 0 & \text{if } x \notin \mathcal{N} \\ & \text{smoothly interpolates on } \mathcal{N} \backslash B_\epsilon \end{cases}$$

Such σ_k is as required and yields a diffeomorphism $f_k : \mathcal{U}_k \to \mathcal{V}_k$. Also notice that $f_k = id$ whenever $\sigma_k = 0$, in particular on $\bigcup_i X_i$ and on a neighborhood of $\bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} X_i$. Let then $\omega^{(k)} = f_k^* \omega^{(k-1)}$: by construction, $\omega^{(k)} = \omega_1 = \omega_2$ along all X_i's, $\omega^{(k)} = \omega_1$ in a neighborhood of $\bigcup_{i=1}^{k} X_i$.

□

Remark. 1. This lemma doesn't need orthogonality for the intersection of the X_i's.

2. The lemma can be easily modified to include self-crossing divisors.

3. A slightly different proof of the lemma can be found by first constructing a retraction of a neighborhood of $\bigcup_i X_i$ onto $\bigcup_i X_i$, then using Moser's argument only once on the resulting vector field.

We complete the proof by proving the following:

Lemma 2. *Given transverse submanifolds $\{X_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ in M, one can find a metric μ on a neighborhood of $\bigcup_i X_i$ such that each X_i is geodesic and, for all i,j, the image of $exp_\mu|_{N_{X_j}X_i} : N_{X_j}X_i \to M$ is contained in X_j.*

Proof. Close to each point of $\bigcup_i X_i$, consider smooth coordinates such that $M = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $X_i = \{x_{i_1} = \dots = x_{i_m} = 0\}$ for all i. Transversality implies that, at the intersection of X_i, X_j, the sets $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ and $\{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$ are disjoint. We can pick a finite atlas made of such charts, which covers a neighborhood of $\bigcup_i X_i$. On each chart $\mathcal{U}$, we can consider the standard metric of $\mathbb{R}^n$, and call $\mu_\mathcal{U}$ the resulting metric on $\mathcal{U} \subset M$. Using a partition of unity, we get a metric μ on the whole neighborhood.

We can check that μ has the desired properties. To see that all X_i's are geodesic, just notice that that is a local property, and it is true for each $\mu_\mathcal{U}$ so it must be true for μ. To see that $exp_\mu|_{N_{X_j}X_i} : N_{X_j}X_i \to M$ is contained in X_j, just notice that X_i, X_j are orthogonal with respect to μ, and X_j is geodesic. □

Remark. The metric μ also pulls back to a metric $\tilde{\mu}_i$ on each NX_i, such that $exp_{\tilde{\mu}_i} = id : NX_i \to NX_i$.

In order to use Lemma 1 to prove the existence of a nice neighborhood of $X \cup Y$, we need to find an analogue of the following classical theorem of Weinstein [Wei71] (for a detailed discussion see [MS98]):

Theorem (Tubular neighborhood theorem)**.** *There exists a map from NX to M such that $f|_X = id$ and $df|_X = id$.*

In particular such a map can be obtained as the exponential map of any metric, applied to $T_X^{\perp^\omega} M$ (which is naturally isomorphic to NX).

2. Normal bundles and connections

Remarks on notation. First of all, for submanifolds $Z \subset X \subset M$, $N_M X$ will indicate the normal bundle to X inside M (sometimes only NX when there is no ambiguity), so that $N_X Z$ is the normal bundle to Z inside X, while $NX|_Z$ indicates the restriction to Z of the normal bundle to X inside M.

There will be some abuse of notation with respect to connections on normal bundles: given $Y \subset X$ a symplectic submanifold of codimension 2, one can obtain a model for the normal bundle by letting $NY = U \times_{U(1)} \mathbb{C}$ where U is a principal $U(1)$-bundle and α is a $U(1)$-connection on U. Whenever the paper mentions a connection α on NX, it is interchangeably a hermitian 1-form on NX or a connection 1-form on a $U(1)$-bundle for which NX is the associated bundle.

Remark. Such an α gives us the same data as a hermitian 1-form on NX, whence the abuse of notation.

One can then build a two-form on $U \times \mathbb{C}$:

$$\omega_\alpha = \omega_Y + d(\rho\alpha) + \omega_{\mathbb{C}}$$

where ρ indicates the hamiltonian function generating the standard circle action on $\mathbb{C}$. Such two-form descends to $U \times_{U(1)} \mathbb{C}$. This is a general fact:

Lemma 3. *Let (F, ω_F) be a symplectic manifold, $G \circlearrowright F$ a Hamiltonian action with moment map μ, P a principal G-bundle over a symplectic base (Y, ω_Y), $X = P \times_G F$ the associated bundle, α a principal connection on P. Then the 2-form $\omega_F - d\langle \alpha, \mu \rangle$ on $P \times F$ descends to a $2-form$ on X. Therefore so does $\Omega = \omega_Y - d\langle \alpha, \mu \rangle + \omega_F$*

Proof. Let v_ξ be the vector field on $P \times F$ corresponding to $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$. Recall that a form η on $P \times F$ is the pullback of a form on X if and only if $\iota_{v_\xi}\eta = \mathcal{L}_{v_\xi}\eta = 0$, which by Cartan's formula is equivalent to $\iota_{v_\xi}\eta = \iota_{v_\xi}(d\eta) = 0$. Since $\omega_F - d\langle \alpha, \mu \rangle$ is closed we will just check that, for every $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$, $\iota_{v_\xi}(\omega_F - d\langle \alpha, \mu \rangle) = 0$.

Since $\mathcal{L}_{v_\xi}\alpha = 0$, also $\mathcal{L}_{v_\xi}(d\langle \alpha, \mu \rangle) = 0$ therefore

$$\iota_{v_\xi} \circ d\langle \alpha, \mu \rangle = -d \circ \iota_{v_\xi}\langle \alpha, \mu \rangle = -d\langle \iota_{-\xi_P}\alpha, \mu \rangle = d\langle \xi, \mu \rangle = \iota_{\xi_P}\omega_F$$

so that $\iota_{v_\xi}(\omega_F - d\langle \alpha, \mu \rangle) = \iota_{\xi_P}\omega_F - \iota_{\xi_P}\omega_F = 0$. □

We can also find a more explicit description of Ω on X. First note that the tangent bundle of P splits as $T^{vert}P \oplus T^{hor}P$. Let $\pi : P \to Y$ be the projection, then the horizontal component $T^{hor}P := \ker \alpha$ is identified by $D\pi$ with π^*TY, while the vertical component is $T^{vert}P := \ker D\pi = \mathfrak{g}$. Thus (omitting notation for pullbacks of projections) we have $T(P \times F) = \mathfrak{g} \oplus \pi^*TY \oplus TF$, and $\mathfrak{g}$ acts on $T(P \times F)$ by $\xi \mapsto (-\xi, 0, \xi_F)$, hence

$$TX \cong \pi^*TY \oplus TF.$$

In other words, a tangent vector $z \in TX$ may be uniquely rewritten as $z = u^\natural + v$, where $u^\natural$ is the horizontal lift of $u \in TY$ to TP while $v \in TF$. Moreover, the vector $\tilde{z} = (0, u^{natural}, v) \in \mathfrak{g} \oplus \pi^*TY \oplus TF \cong T(P \times F)$ projects to z. This means that one can compute $\Omega(z_1, z_2)$ by evaluating $\Omega(\tilde{z}_1, \tilde{z}_2)$.

Now let's describe Ω. First recall that the curvature is $F_\alpha \in \Omega^2(M; P \times_G \mathfrak{g})$. It induces a 2-form via pullback on P: $\pi^*F_\alpha = d\alpha + \frac{1}{2}[\alpha \wedge \alpha]$. Notice that $d\langle \alpha, \mu \rangle = \langle d\alpha, \mu \rangle + \langle \alpha \wedge d\mu \rangle$ on $P \times F$; the key observation is that $\alpha(\tilde{z}_1) = \alpha(\tilde{z}_2) = 0$. Then we can calculate

$$\Omega(z_1, z_2) = \Omega(\tilde{z}_1, \tilde{z}_2) =$$

$$= \omega_Y(u_1, u_2) - \langle d\alpha(\tilde{z}_1, \tilde{z}_2), \mu \rangle - \frac{1}{2}(\langle \alpha(\tilde{z}_1), d\mu(\tilde{z}_2) \rangle - \langle \alpha(\tilde{z}_2), d\mu(\tilde{z}_1) \rangle) + \omega_F(v_1, v_2)$$

$$= \omega_Y(u_1, u_2) - \langle d\alpha(\tilde{z}_1, \tilde{z}_2), \mu \rangle + \omega_F(v_1, v_2)$$

$$= \omega_Y(u_1, u_2) - \langle (\pi^*F_\alpha - \frac{1}{2}[\alpha \wedge \alpha])(\tilde{z}_1, \tilde{z}_2), \mu \rangle + \omega_F(v_1, v_2)$$

$$= \omega_Y(u_1, u_2) - \langle \pi^*F_\alpha(\tilde{z}_1, \tilde{z}_2), \mu \rangle + \langle \frac{1}{2}[\alpha \wedge \alpha])(\tilde{z}_1, \tilde{z}_2), \mu \rangle + \omega_F(v_1, v_2)$$

$$= \omega_Y(u_1, u_2) - \langle F_\alpha(u_1, u_2), \mu \rangle + \omega_F(v_1, v_2).$$

Example 2.1. If, for instance, α is the flat connection induced by a trivialization, then the form on $Y \times F$ is given by $\omega_Y + \omega_F$. In fact this is an if and only if. In slightly different words: F_α is the obstruction to ω_F pushing forward to a form on X.

Corollary 2.1. *For a complex line bundle $U \times_{U(1)} \mathbb{C}$, with a connection α, over a symplectic base (Y, ω_Y) the 2-form $\omega_\alpha = \omega_Y + d(\rho\alpha) + \omega_{\mathbb{C}}$ descends to a closed 2-form on $U \times_{U(1)} \mathbb{C}$. This form can be described as $\omega_Y + \rho F_\alpha + \omega_{\mathbb{C}}$ with respect to a horizontal/vertical splitting due to α.*

Similarly, if $Y \subset M$ has codimension $2k$ and $NY = \bigoplus_{s=1}^k \mathcal{L}_s$ is a sum of line bundles, then $NY = U \times_{U(1)^k} \mathbb{C}^k$ where U is the sum of unit bundles inside L_s's. If α_s's are $U(1)$-connections, then $\bigoplus_{s=1}^k \alpha_s$ is a connection on U and the induced symplectic form on a tubular neighborhood of Y is

$$\omega_{\oplus_s \alpha_s} = \omega_Y + \sum_s (\rho_s F_{\alpha_s}) + \omega_{\mathbb{C}^k}.$$

Corollary 2.2. *Let's consider the case of $Y \subset M$ of (real) codimension higher than two. Then NY is a $\mathbb{C}^k$-bundle and the structure group is $G = U(k) \cap Sp(k)$. Given a connection form α on the corresponding principal G bundle P, we get an induced symplectic form*

$$\omega_\alpha = \omega_Y + \langle F_\alpha, \mu \rangle + \omega_{\mathbb{C}^k}.$$

More in general we can define $\omega_{\oplus_s \alpha_s}$ on a sum of bundles, where α_s is the connection on a complex vector bundle of dimension k_s over Y:

$$\omega_{\oplus_s \alpha_s} = \omega_Y + \sum_s \langle F_{\alpha_s}, \mu_s \rangle + \omega_{\mathbb{C}^{\sum_s k_s}}.$$

3. A REMARK ON TRANSVERSALITY

In the rest of the discussion all collections of submanifolds will be transverse in the following sense:

Definition 2. *Let $\{X_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ be a finite collection of submanifolds of M. Let $X_I = \bigcap_{i\in I} X_i$ for all subsets $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. The collection is called **transverse** if $NX_I = \oplus_{i\in I} NX_i|_{X_I}$.*

This is stronger than just pairwise transversality. On the other hand, once we move to the symplectic world, we assume orthogonality in the following sense:

Definition 3. *The intersection of two symplectic submanifolds $X_1, X_2 \subset (M, \omega)$ is **orthogonal** if there is an orthogonal decomposition $TM = TX_{12} \oplus^\perp NX_1 \oplus^\perp NX_2$.*

Remark. This definition in particular implies that the two submanifolds are transverse. If you care about other situations (e.g. two axes in $\mathbb{R}^3$) then you should look for slightly different definitions.

We can only make pairwise assumptions, because of the following:

Lemma 4. *Let $\{X_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ be a finite collection of symplectic submanifolds of (M, ω). Assume that, whenever $i \neq j$, X_i, X_j intersect orthogonally. Then $\{X_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ is a transverse collection.*

Proof. The key observation is that for orthogonal sums, $NX_i \perp NX_j$ for all $j \neq i$ implies $NX_i \perp \oplus_{j\in J} NX_j$ whenever $i \notin J$. This means $\{NX_i\}_{i\in I}$ is a linearly independent collection of subspaces in TM. Pick a point $x \in X_I$. Notice that there is an embedding $N_x X_i \overset{\iota_i}{\hookrightarrow} N_x X_I$ when $i \in I$ (if a vector is orthogonal to X_i then it must also be orthogonal to the subset X_I). Now let's consider the map $\oplus_i \iota_i : \oplus_{i\in I} N_x X_i \to NX_I$. This map is injective since $NX_i \subset NX_I$ are linearly independent subspaces. It is then an isomorphism because of dimensions. We can use the formula for the dimension of an intersection of vector subspaces and get $\dim(T_x X_I) = \dim(\bigcap_{i\in I} T_x X_i) \geq \sum_i \dim TX_i - (k-1)\cdot n = \sum_{i\in I}(n - \dim NX_i) - (k-1)\cdot n = n - \sum_{i\in I} \dim NX_i$ (here $k = \#I$, $n = \dim(TM)$. Then $\dim NX_I = n - \dim(T_x X_I) \leq n - (n - \sum_{i\in I} \dim(NX_i)) = \sum_{i\in I} \dim NX_i$. □

4. PLUMBING: DEFINITION AND PROPERTIES

In order to pursue an analogue of Theorem 1 one needs to define a standard model for a neighborhood of crossing divisors (an analogue of the normal bundle for a single divisor). We give a definition of *plumbing* based on some rigid data, in view of the application to symplectic setting. In order to make the construction more understandable, we will first describe the whole construction for two symplectic submanifolds X, Y of the manifold (M, ω). The reader can also directly jump to the general definition 6.

4.1. **Plumbing of 2 divisors.** Let X, Y be symplectic submanifolds of (M, ω).

Definition 4. *Given tubular neighborhoods $\psi_X : N_X(X \cap Y) \to X$ and $\psi_Y : N_Y(X \cap Y) \to Y$ and connections α_X on NX, α_Y on NY, define the equivalence relation:*

$$\forall z \in X \cap Y, v_X \in N_{X;z}(X \cap Y), v_Y \in N_{Y;z}(X \cap Y)$$

$$NX \ni (\psi_X(z, v_X), \Gamma_{\alpha_X}(v_Y)) \sim (\psi_Y(z, v_Y), \Gamma_{\alpha_Y}(v_X)) \in NY.$$

Here, $\Gamma_{\alpha_X}, \Gamma_{\alpha_Y}$ are parallel transport maps (described below).

*Define now the **plumbing**:*

$$N_M(X \cup Y) := (N_M X \cup N_M Y) / \sim .$$

Further explanation

Above, $(\psi_X(z, v_X), \Gamma_{\alpha_X}(v_Y))$ refers to the following inside NX (let $\pi : NX \to X$ be the bundle projection):

- $x = \psi_X(z, v_X)$ is a point in X;
- A vector $v_Y \in \pi^{-1}(z)$ can be mapped by parallel transport with respect to α_X, over the path $\{\psi_X(z, t \cdot v_X)\}_{0 \le t \le 1}$ (going from z to x in X). This gives a vector in $\pi^{-1}(x)$; this map is denoted $\Gamma_{\alpha_X}(v_Y)$. Similarly for $\Gamma_{\alpha_Y}(v_X)$.

Note that $\pi^{-1}(z)$ is naturally identified with $N_{Y;z}(X \cap Y)$ (because the intersection is transverse).

Alternative description

Here's a different way of thinking about it: notice that $N_M(X \cap Y) = N_X(X \cap Y) \oplus N_Y(X \cap Y)$. Given a connection α_X on NX and a sympectic embedding $\psi_X : N_X(X \cap Y) \to X$ we can define the map $\xi^X_{X \cap Y} : N_M(X \cap Y) \to NX$, $(z, v_X, v_Y) \mapsto (\psi_X(z, v_X), \Gamma_{\alpha_X}(v_Y))$ (see above for the exact meaning of $\Gamma_{\alpha_X}(v_Y)$). This is an embedding, and similarly one can write an embedding $\xi^Y_{X \cap Y} : N_M(X \cap Y) \to NY$ with respect to a connection α_Y.

Definition 5 (Equivalent definition)**.** *Define the plumbing to be*

$$(N_M X \cup N_M Y) / \sim \text{ where } \xi^X_{X \cap Y}(p) \sim \xi^Y_{X \cap Y}(p).$$

The following picture clarifies the procedure (the arrows need to commute):



FIGURE 2. The plumbing of X_i, X_j is obtained by identifying the images of $\xi^i_{ij} : NX_{ij} \to NX_i$ and $\xi^j_{ij} : NX_{ij} \to NX_j$.

Remark. Note that the choice of connections is equivalent to choosing appropriate bundle isomorphisms. The reason to use connections has to do with constructing a symplectic form, and will be made clear in the next section.

4.2. **Discussion on retractions.** As before, we need to use parallel transport with respect to α_i to locally trivialize NX_i. Clearly, a neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_{ij}$ of X_{ij} in X_i admits a smooth retraction $\rho_{ij} : \mathcal{N}_{ij} \to X_{ij}$. This determines, for each $x \in X_i$, a path $\gamma_x : [0,1] \to X_i, \gamma_x(0) = x, \gamma_x(1) \in X_{ij}$. Once we fix such retraction, we can define, for each $x \in X_i$, $(\Gamma^j_{\alpha_i})^{-1} : N_x X_i \to N_{\gamma_x(1)} X_i$ to be the parallel transport map over the path γ_x.

Remark. (4.2) In view of the symplectic construction, this is enough. The properties we require on connections (see Definition 7) in order to build a symplectic plumbing are enough to verify that any such retraction yields the same $\Gamma^j_{\alpha_i}$ (basically because the flatness of the connection implies that parallel transport maps are independent of the chosen path).

In order for the plumbing to be well-defined for $n > 2$ for any choice of α_i, we can't use just any retraction. We need to chose an appropriate retraction, which has good behavior at higher intersections. What we need is a set of retractions ρ_{ij} which agree on overlaps, therefore inducing a retraction of a neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_i$ of $\bigcup_{j\neq i} X_{ij}$ in X_i onto $\bigcup_{j\neq i} X_{ij}$.

Let's do the following: given a neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_i$ of $\bigcup_{j\neq i} X_{ij}$ in X_i, produce an open cover by taking, for each set of indices I, a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_I$ of $X_I \setminus \bigcup_{I' \supset I} \mathcal{U}_{I'}$ in X_i and a smooth retraction $\tilde{\rho}_I : \mathcal{U}_I \to X_I$. We can then use a partition of unity to combine such retractions into a retraction $\rho : \mathcal{N}_i \to \bigcup_{j\neq i} X_{ij}$. This way, for each $X_i j$, the restriction of ρ to a neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_{ij}$ of X_{ij} in X_i is $\rho_{ij} : \mathcal{N}_{ij} \to X_{ij}$. The collection $\{\rho_{ij}\}_{j\neq i}$ is now compatible in the sense that $\Gamma^j_{\alpha_i} = \Gamma^k_{\alpha_i}$ in a neighborhood of X_{ijk}.

4.3. **Plumbing of n divisors.** Analogously one can define the plumbing of n divisors, but more care should be used in determining all the necessary data to form a plumbing. We will just give a definition here; the fact that plumbings can always be constructed from the data of any orthogonal intersection will be a consequence of the main theorems.

Remark on notation: Throughout the paper, for each $I \subset \mathcal{I}$, $X_I := \bigcap_{i\in I} X_i$ will denote the intersection.

Definition 6. *Given a family $\{X_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ of smooth transversely intersecting divisors, with $\#I = n$ assume the following data is given:*

- ◇ *for all $\emptyset \neq I' \subset I \subset \mathcal{I}$, tubular neighborhood maps $\psi^{I'}_I : N_{X_{I'}} X_I \to X_{I'}$, such that if $I'' \subset I' \subset I$ then $\psi^{I''}_{I'} \circ \psi^{I'}_I = \psi^{I''}_I$.*
- ◇ *connections α_i on $N_M X_i$.*

*then the **n-plumbing** (or just plumbing) is the space*

$$N_M(\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{I}} X_i) = (\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{I}} NX_i)/\sim$$

where

$$NX_i \ni (\psi^i_{ij}(z, v_j), \Gamma_{\alpha_i}(v_i)) \sim (\psi^j_{ij}(z, v_i), \Gamma_{\alpha_j}(v_j)) \in NX_j,$$
$$\forall z \in X_{ij}, v_j \in NX_j|_{X_{ij}}, v_i \in NX_i|_{X_{ij}}.$$

For the definition of Γ_{α_i} in the general case, see 4.2. However, in view of the final result, it's not wrong to think of Γ_{α_i} as parallel transport onto any fibre $N_z X_i$ for some $z \in X_{ij}$; in fact, parallel transport can be over a linear path, or any other path: see Remark 4.2. The result of plumbing is sketched in Figure 3.



FIGURE 3. Connections on NX_i, NX_j define the plumbing.

Let's check that the plumbing is well defined (nothing bad happens at higher intersections):

Lemma 5. *Each point of NX_i in a neighborhood of X_{ij} is identified with exactly one point of NX_j.*

Proof. The trouble potentially arises at higher intersection points. Consider a neighborhood of X_{ijk}. Consider a point $(z, v_i, v_j, v_k) \in NX_{ijk} \cong NX_i \oplus NX_j \oplus NX_k$. When looking at the equivalence relation from NX_i to NX_j we get

$$N(X_i) \ni (\psi^i_{ij}(\psi^{ij}_{ijk}(z, v_k), v_j), \Gamma^j{}_{\alpha_i}(v_i)) \sim (\psi^j_{ij}(\psi^{ij}_{ijk}(z, v_k), v_i), \Gamma^i_{\alpha_j}(v_j)) \in N(X_j).$$

On the other hand if we consider NX_j and NX_k we get

$$N(X_j) \ni (\psi^j_{jk}(\psi^{jk}_{ijk}(z, v_i), v_k), \Gamma^k_{\alpha_j}(v_j)) \sim (\psi^k_{jk}(\psi^{jk}_{ijk}(z, v_i), v_j), \Gamma^j_{\alpha_k}(v_k)) \in N(X_k)$$

while NX_i, NX_k yield

$$N(X_i) \ni (\psi^i_{ik}(\psi^{ik}_{ijk}(z, v_j), v_k), \Gamma^k_{\alpha_i}(v_i)) \sim (\psi^k_{ik}(\psi^{ik}_{ijk}(z, v_j), v_k), \Gamma^i_{\alpha_k}(v_k)) \in N(X_k)$$

so NX_i gets identified with NX_k both directly and through NX_j: do the two identifications agree? We can use the compatibility assumption, $\psi^{I''}_{I'} \circ \psi^{I'}_{I} = \psi^{I''}_{I}$. From 4.2 we also know that $\Gamma^j_{\alpha_i} = \Gamma^k_{\alpha_i}$ in a neighborhood of X_{ijk}. All the above relations then reduce to

$$(\psi^i_{ijk}(z, v_k, v_j), \Gamma_{\alpha_i}(v_i)) \sim (\psi^j_{ijk}(z, v_k, v_i), \Gamma_{\alpha_j}(v_j)) \sim (\psi^k_{ijk}(z, v_i, v_j), \Gamma_{\alpha_k}(v_k)).$$

□

Remark (Important). The data used to construct the (n)-plumbing consists of a set of maps which can be thought of as the data of, for each X_i, the (n-1)-plumbing of its intersection with the other divisors, plus an embedding of such (n-1)-plumbing into X_i.

To prove the existence of n-plumbings, we'll proceed by induction on n. The main ingredient of the inductive step is: given a k-plumbing of submanifolds in M, there exists an embedding into M.

Proposition 4.1. *Given the following:*

- ◇ *a family* $\{X_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ *of transversely intersecting divisors in a smooth manifold* M*;*
- ◇ *the data of a plumbing* $N(\cup_i X_i)$ *as in Definition 6;*
- ◇ *a choice of maps* $g_i : N_M(X_i) \to TM|_{X_i}$*, left inverses of the projection map* $TM|_{X_i} \to N_M(X_i)$ *and compatible with the data of the plumbing, i.e.* $g_i|_{N_{X_i}X_{ij}} = d_{X_{ij}}\psi^i_{ij} : N_{X_i}X_{ij} \to TX_i \subset TM|_{X_i}$ *for all* i*.*

Then there exist maps

$$F^i : NX_i \to M$$

such that:

(i) $F^i|_{X_i} = id$*;*
(ii) $d_{X_i}F^i = g_i + id : T(NX_i)|_{X_i} \cong NX_i \oplus TX_i \to TM|_{X_i}$*;*
(iii) such F^i*'s agree with respect to* $\sim$*.*

This last property implies that they descend to a map on the quotient

$$F : N(\cup_i X_i) \to M.$$

Remark. Without (ii), that is, the requirement on the derivative of F^i, the theorem would be straightforward: see step 1 of the proof. Condition (ii) makes sense in view of the results in the next section: it is needed in order for us to refine the construction above so that the maps F^i's become symplectomorphisms. In particular, notice that a symplectic form on M yields a natural choice of $g_i : N_M(X_i) \cong TM|^{\perp}_{X_i} \to TM|_{X_i}$ for all i.

Remark (on notation). Consider the local diffeomorphisms $\psi^{I'}_I : N_{X_{I'}}X_I \to X_{I'}$ for $I' \subset I \subset \mathcal{I}$. There is a push-forward map $(\psi^{I'}_I)_* : N_{X_{I'}}X_I \oplus N_{X_{I\setminus I'}}X_I \cong NX_I \to NX_{I'}$ which is an isomorphism of bundles with base $N_{X_{I'}}X_I \cong X_{I'}$(see Figure).

Proof. The proof is divided into 7 steps. We will start by constructing maps $\nu_{ij} : N(X_i \cap X_j) \to M$ (when there is no ambiguity we'll write ν instead of ν_{ij} to keep notation lighter) such that $\nu(N_{X_i}X_{ij}) \subset X_i$ and $\nu(N_{X_j}X_{ij}) \subset X_j$. The idea is that such ν_{ij} can be used to construct maps $\nu_{ij} \circ (\psi^i_{ij})^{-1}_* : NX_i \to M$. Step 1 discusses the construction of ν in more detail in order to assure compatibility on different strata.

The goal of steps 3-4 is to deform ν to a new diffeomorphism $\mu : N(X_{ij}) \to M$ such that

- ◇ $d_{N_iX_{ij}}\mu = g_i : T(N(X_i \cap X_j))|_{N_{X_i}X_{ij}} \cong N_{N(X_{ij})}N_{X_i}(X_{ij}) \cong N_MX_i \to TM$;
- ◇ $\mu|_{N_{X_i}X_{ij}} = \psi^i_{ij}$, for all i, j.

Such μ will be used in step 5 to construct F^i, F^j on a neighborhood of X_{ij}; step 6 extends F^i, F^j to all of X_i, Y_j respectively.

Step 7 deals with extending the process from two submanifolds to all of the $X_i's$.

Step 1. Consider the metric μ constructed in Lemma 2. One could be tempted to define $F^i : NX_i \to M$ as $F^i = exp_\mu \circ g_i$. Such F^i's would clearly satisfy (i); moreover, they'd satisfy (ii) by definition. On the other hand, there is no reason to believe that such F^i's would glue (in general, given a metric λ in a neighborhood of X_{ij}, the three maps $exp_\lambda : NX_i \to M, exp_\lambda : NX_j \to M, exp_\lambda : NX_{ij} \to M$ don't agree on the intersection). In order

to get maps that glue, we can try to define $F^i = F^j = \nu_{ij} = exp_\mu : NX_{ij} \to M$ close to an intersection X_{ij}. This is enough to glue pairwise, but if we want compatibility at higher intersections, we need $\nu_{ij} \circ (\psi^{ij}_{ijk})_* = \nu_{jk} \circ (\psi^{jk}_{ijk})_*$ for all i, j, k. We'll discuss this in Step 2.

Notice that the maps ν_{ij} naturally satisfy condition (iii), but they don't satisfy (ii). The problem is that once we try to embed $NX_i \to M$ and $NX_j \to M$ by composing ν_{ij} with the maps coming from the plumbing data, we get

$$\nu_{ij} \circ (\psi^i_{ij})^{-1}_* : NX_i \to M \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_{ij} \circ (\psi^j_{ij})^{-1}_* : NX_j \to M$$

and it may not be true that $d_{X_i}\nu_{ij} \circ d_{X_i}(\psi^i_{ij})^{-1}_* = (g_i, id) : TNX_i \cong NX_i \oplus TX_i \to TM$. Similarly for $d_{X_j}\nu_{ij} \circ d_{X_j}(\psi^j_{ij})^{-1}_*$.

Step 2. To build compatible ν_{ij}, one can start from the lowest dimensional intersection strata: let $X_I = \bigcap_{i \in I} X_i$ for some maximal nonempty intersection X_I, $I \subsetneq \mathcal{I}$. Let $\nu_I : NX_I \to M$ be some diffeomorphism sending each $N_{X_i}X_I \to X_i$. In particular, we consider $\nu_I = exp_\mu : NX_I \to M$. Moving down to lower intersections, one can construct a ν_J which is equal to ν_I close to X_I for all $I \supset J$, and it interpolates with $exp_\mu : NX_J \to M$ otherwise. This yields $\{\nu_{ij}\}_{i,j \in \mathcal{I}}$ such that $\nu_{ij} \circ (\psi^{ij}_{ijk})_* = \nu_{jk} \circ (\psi^{jk}_{ijk})_*$ for all i, j, k.

Step 3. To ease notation, let's rename $\nu := \nu_{ij}$. The map ν yields some bundle isomorphism $d_{X_i}\nu \circ d_{X_i}(\psi^i_{ij})^{-1}_* : T(NX_i) \to TM$, possibly different from $(g_i, id) : NX_i \oplus TX_i \to TM$. To fix this, we will compose with an appropriate map $\eta_i : NX_i \to NX_i$ (defined on some neighborhood of X_{ij}) so that $d(\nu \circ (\psi^i_{ij})^{-1}_* \circ \eta_i) = (g_i, id)$. We are therefore looking for a map $\eta_i : NX_i \to NX_i$ such that $d_{X_i}\eta_i : T_{X_i}NX_i \to T_{X_i}NX_i$ is equal to $(d_{X_i}\nu \circ d_{X_i}(\psi^i_{ij})^{-1}_*)^{-1} \circ (g_i, id) : NX_i \oplus TX_i \to NX_i \oplus TX_i$ (here we are using the fact that $T_{X_i}NX_i \cong NX_i \oplus TX_i$ canonically).

Given the chart $(g_i, id) : NX_i \oplus TX_i \xrightarrow{\sim} T_{X_i}M$, we can rewrite the linear map $(d_{X_i}\nu \circ d_{X_i}(\psi^i_{ij})^{-1}_*)^{-1} : (v, w)_x \mapsto (c_x v, w + a_x(v))_x$ where $c_x \in \mathbb{R}^*$ and $a_x : NX_i \to TX_i$ is linear. Moreover from the assumption that $g_i|_{N_jX_{ij}} = d\psi^j_{ij}$ it follows that $c_y = 1, a_y = 0$ for all $y \in X_{ij}$. To define η_i, let's consider a chart at some point $x_0 \in X_i$ and a local trivialization of NX_i so that we can say that (locally) $NX_i \cong N_{x_0}X_i \times TX_i$. Use this chart to define $\eta_i : N_{x_0}X_i \times TX_i \to N_{x_0}X_i \times TX_i$ mapping $(x, w) \mapsto (x + a_x(v), c_x v)$.

This map satisfies $d_{X_i}\eta_i = (d_{X_i}\nu \circ d_{X_i}(\psi^i_{ij})^{-1}_*)^{-1} \circ (g_i, id)$. Moreover, $d_{X_j}\eta_j = id$ because $c_y = 1, a_y = 0$ for all $y \in X_{ij}$. Repeat the construction to find $\eta_j : NX_j \to NX_j$.

Step 4. Now we can modify ν by applying the maps constructed above: define

$$\mu = \nu \circ (\psi^i_{ij})^{*-1} \circ \eta_i \circ (\psi^i_{ij})^* \circ (\psi^j_{ij})^{*-1} \circ \eta_j \circ (\psi^j_{ij})^*.$$

We can check that μ satisfies all the requirements.
This is because

$$d_{X_i}\mu =$$

$$= d_{N_{X_i}(X_{ij})}\nu \circ d_{X_i}(\psi^i_{ij})^{*-1} \circ d_{X_i}\eta_i \circ d_{N_{X_i}(X_{ij})}(\psi^i_{ij})^* \circ d_{X_i}(\psi^j_{ij})^{*-1} \circ d_{X_i}\eta_j \circ d_{N_{X_i}(X_{ij})}(\psi^j_{ij})^*$$

$$= d_{N_{X_i}(X_{ij})}\nu \circ d_{X_i}(\psi^i_{ij})^{*-1} \circ (d\nu|_{X_i} \circ d(\psi^i_{ij})|^{*-1}_{X_i})^{-1} \circ (g_i, id) \circ$$
$$d_{N_{X_i}(X_{ij})}(\psi^i_{ij})^* \circ d_{X_i}(\psi^j_{ij})^{*-1} \circ id \circ d_{N_{X_i}(X_{ij})}(\psi^j_{ij})^*$$
$$= (g_i, id) \circ d_{N_{X_i}(X_{ij})}(\psi^i_{ij})^*$$

which is exactly what we needed. Similarly,

$$d_{X_j}\mu = (g_j, id) \circ d_{N_{X_j}(X_{ij})}(\psi^j_{ij})^*.$$

Step 5. Now we can use $\mu : NX_{ij} \to M$ to build maps $f^i = \mu \circ (\psi^i_{ij})^{*-1} : NX_i|_{Im((\psi^i_{ij})_*)} \to M$, $f^j = \mu \circ (\psi^j_{ij})^{*-1} : NX_j|_{Im((\psi^i_{ij})_*)} \to M$ which are defined in a neighborhood of X_{ij}. By definition these agree on the quotient $N(X_{ij})$ on a neighborhood of X_{ij}. By construction they satisfy the condition on the derivative.

Step 6. We need to show that the maps f^i, f^j, which are defined on a neighborhood of X_{ij}, can be extended respectively to full neighborhoods of X_i, X_j in NX_i, NX_j.

Let's consider X_i, wlog. The map f^i close to X_{ij} gives a diffeomorphism to some neighborhood of M whose derivative along X is the identity. Now consider any neighborhood embedding $h^i : NX_i \to M$ defined along all of X_i and such that $d_{X_i}h^i = (g_i, id)$ (note that when g_i is induced by a symplectic form, h^i is given by the symplectic neighborhood theorem). Pick a smooth function $t \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(X)$ such that for some small $0 \leq \epsilon_1 \leq \epsilon_2$,

$$t(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in B_{\epsilon_1}(X \cap Y) \\ 1 & \text{if } x \notin B_{\epsilon_2}(X \cap Y) \\ & \text{smoothly interpolates on } B_{\epsilon_2} \backslash B_{\epsilon_1} \end{cases}$$

Define a map $F^i : NX \to M$, $F^i = (1-t)f^i + th^i$ which still induces $d_{X_i}f^i = (g_i, id)$. When restricted to a suitable neighborhood of X_i in NX_i, F^i is still a diffeomorphism. Conclusion: the extended maps F^i, F^j agree on a neighborhood of X_{ij} and satisfy all requirements.

Step 7. Now just follow the same procedure along all intersections $\{X_{ij}\}_{i \neq j \in \mathcal{I}}$: first build $\mu_{ij} : NX_{ij} \to M$ and then build maps F^i by interpolating $\mu_{ij} \circ (\psi^i_{ij})^{-1}_*$ close to X_{ij} and h_i on the rest of NX_i (see Step 6). One needs to check that the construction of these maps is coherent on higher order intersections, but this boils down to checking that $\mu_{ij} \circ (\psi^j_{ij})^{-1}_* = \mu_{jk} \circ (\phi^j_{jk})^{-1}_*$ for all i, j, k. Looking back at the construction of ν_{ij} in Step 1 and the metrics in Step 2, we can deduce that $\nu_{ij} \circ (\phi^j_{ij})^{-1}_* = \nu_{jk} \circ (\phi^j_{jk})^{-1}_*$ for all i, j, k and this implies the same equality for μ.

□

We can also make the following observation:

Lemma 6. *There is a metric g on the plumbing such that $exp_g = id : P \to P$, i.e. $exp_g = id : NX_I \to NX_I$ for all I.*

To any diffeomorphism $\nu : P \to M$ corresponds a metric λ on M such that ν is obtained as gluing of $\nu_i = exp_\lambda : NX_i \to NX_i$ for all i.

Proof. Construct a metric g on $N_M X_{ij}$ by first picking metrics g_i, g_j on X_i, X_j that agree on the intersection ($g_i|_{X_{ij}} = g_j|_{X_{ij}}$), then defining g on M at a point of X_{ij}, as $g = g_i|_{X_{ij}} + \tilde{g_{ij}}$ where $\tilde{g_{ij}} = ((\psi^i_{ij})_*)^* g_i + ((\psi^j_{ij})_*)^* g_j$ on $N(X_{ij}) = N_{X_i} X_{ij} \oplus N_{X_j} X_{ij}$. Note that in order to maintain good compatibility for higher intersections, we can ask that $g_{X_{ij}}$ itself is given by $g_i|_{X_{ijk}} + \tilde{g_{ijk}}$ close to X_{ijk} and so on. Recall that the data of a plumbing induces a connection $\alpha_i \oplus \alpha_j$ on NX_{ij}. This is all we need to extend g to all of $N_M X_{ij}$: if $t = (z, v_x, v_y) \in N_z X_{ij}$, let $\Gamma_{t\to z}$ indicate parallel transport from $t = (z, v_x, v_y)$ to $z = (z, 0, 0)$ inside $N_z(X \cap Y)$along a linear path. Define g at the point t using the value of g at the point z: $g|_t(v, w) = g|_z(\Gamma_{t\to z}(v), \Gamma_{t\to z}(w))$. Such g is, by construction, a metric such that $exp_g = id : NX_I \to NX_I$ for all I.

For the second statement, just consider the push-forward metric $\lambda = \nu^* g$ on M. □

The next goal is to use Proposition 4.1 to show that plumbings exist and embed.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\{X_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ be a finite set of transverse submanifolds. Given:*

- *$g_i : NX_i \to TM$ right inverses of the projection maps (note that they yield splittings $(g_i, id) : TM \cong NX_i \oplus TX_i$) such that $g_i(N_{X_j} X_{ij}) \subset TX_j \subset TM$;*
- *connections α_i on NX_i.*

Then one can find plumbing maps $\{\psi^{I'}_I\}_{I'\subset I\subset\mathcal{I}}$ and use them together with the α_i's to build a plumbing $N(\bigcup_i X_i)$. Furthermore, there is an embedding $F : N(\bigcup_i X_i) \to M$ such that $d_{X_i} F = (g_i, id) : T(NX_i) \to TM$.

Proof. This is done by induction in the following way: for any $1 \le k \le n$ one can build, for any I such that $\#I = n - k$, the k-plumbing of $\{X_{I\cup\{i\}}\}_{i\notin I}$ in X_I and embed such plumbing into X_I. For $k = 1$ this is just the usual neighborhood theorem applied to $X_{\mathcal{I}} \subset X_{\mathcal{I}\setminus i}$. For $k = n$ this yields the n-plumbing and an embedding of it into $X_\emptyset = M$.

For the inductive step, assume that all $\{\psi^{I'}_I\}_{I'\subset I\subset\mathcal{I},\#I'\ge n-k}$ have been constructed. Pick J such that $\#J = n - k - 1$. Then $\{\psi^{I'}_I\}_{\#I'=n-k, J\subset I'}$ have been built in a compatible way. Moreover $\alpha_{J\setminus I'}$ induces a connection on $N_{X_J} X_{I'} \cong NX_{I'\setminus J}|_{X_{I'}}$. Together this yields the data of a plumbing $N(\bigcup_{I'\supset J} X_{I'})$ of $\{X_{I'}\}_{J\subset I',\#I'=n-k}$. Also the restriction of g_i to $N_{X_J} X_{I'}$ (where $i = J\setminus I'$) yields maps as required in Proposition 4.1. We can then apply Proposition 4.1 to find maps $\psi^J_{I'} : N_{X_J} X_{I'} \to X_J$ that are compatible with the plumbing data above.

□

5. Symplectic form on plumbing

The reason we explicitly use connections in the construction of a plumbing is the following: as discussed before, a choice of connection on a symplectic vector bundle yields a symplectic form in a neighborhood of the zero section. Considering the discussion in section 2, it is also not surprising that the curvature of the chosen connection will play an important role.

A good model of plumbing is one that carries a symplectic form and can be symplectically embedded in M. Ideally, given symplectic submanifolds $\{X_i\} \subset M$, plumbing maps which are symplectomorphisms, and connections $\{\alpha_i\}$ on each NX_i, then one could

hope that the induced symplectic forms ω_{α_i} on NX_i naturally induce a symplectic form $N(\bigcup_i X_i)$. Unfortunately, it is not true in general that such induced forms agree with respect to $\sim$. Therefore they may not descend to a form on the plumbing unless we make further assumptions.

Let's focus on just two submanifolds X, Y and connections α_X on NX, α_Y on NY. For ω_{α_X} and ω_{α_Y} to agree on the quotient $(NX \cup NY)/\sim$, we need α_X and α_Y to satisfy some extra properties. For instance, requiring the connections to be flat (that is, requiring that the curvatures $F_{\alpha_X}, F_{\alpha_Y}$ vanish) would simplify things much. Such a choice is not always possible mostly because:

- ◇ the connection α_X needs to agree with the connection α_{ψ_Y} on $N_Y(X \cap Y)$ which makes the embedding $\psi_Y : N_Y(X \cap Y) \to Y$ a symplectomorphism: $\alpha_X|_{N_Y(X\cap Y)} = \alpha_{\psi_Y}$ (here, α_{ψ_Y} may not be flat);
- ◇ the global curvature always has to satisfy $[F_{\alpha_X}] = c_1(NX)$ (which may not be 0).

Luckily, there are some conditions we can require from the connections that are both achievable (see Lemma 7) and are enough to guarantee that the plumbing inherits a symplectic form (see Lemma 9). In the case of multiple submanifolds, the same conditions are needed pairwise.

For any two intersecting manifolds X_i, X_j, we will ask that the following holds in a neighborhood $\mathcal{N}$ of X_{ij}:

Definition 7. *A connection α_i on NX_i is **compatible** with X_j and $\psi^i_{ij} : N_(X_i; z)X_{ij} \to X_i$, if*

$$F_{\alpha_i}|_{\psi^i_{ij}(N_{(X_i),z}X_{ij})} = 0 \quad \textit{for any} \quad z \in X_{ij},$$

(that is, α_i is flat on each fibre of $N_{X_i}X_{ij}$).

*It is **compatible** with $\hat{\alpha}_j$ on $N_{X_j}(X_{ij})$ if*

$$\alpha_i|_{\pi^{-1}(X_{ij})} = \hat{\alpha}_j.$$

This is more feasible than requiring flatness everywhere (i.e. the obstructions previously mentioned don't apply anymore).

The neighborhood we consider will take the form $\mathcal{N} = \{(x, v) | x = \psi(z, v_X), ||v_X|| < \epsilon_1, ||v|| < \epsilon_2\}$.

Remark. An equivalent formulation would be: close to X_{ij}, the connection form α_i is the pullback (via retraction) of the connection $\hat{\alpha}_j$ to a full neighborhood of $N_{X_j}X_{ij} \subset NX_i$.

Lemma 7. *Given a connection $\hat{\alpha}_Y$ on $NX|_{(X\cap Y)}$ (note that this is the same as $N_Y(X \cap Y)$), one can find a neighborhood $\mathcal{N}$ of $X \cap Y$ in X and a connection α_X on NX such that:*

$$\alpha_X|_{\pi^{-1}(X\cap Y)} = \hat{\alpha}_Y \textit{ and } F_{\alpha_X}|_{\psi_X(N_{X,z}(X\cap Y))} = 0 \textit{ in } \mathcal{N}.$$

Proof. Let $c_1(NX) = [\Omega] \in H_{dR}(X)$; let's pick the image of the embedding $\psi_X : N_X(X \cap Y) \to X$ as a neighborhood $\mathcal{M}$ of $X \cap Y$ in X; note that $\mathcal{M}$ projects onto $(X \cap Y)$ (call this projection π) and that gives an isomorphism of $H_{dR}(\mathcal{M})$ and $H_{dR}(X \cap Y)$. So

$$\Omega|_{\mathcal{M}} = \pi^*(\Omega|_{X\cap Y}) + \Omega'$$

where $\Omega' = d\beta$ is exact. Note that the condition $F_{\alpha_X}|_{\psi_X(N_{X,z}(X\cap Y))} = 0$ is equivalent to $F_\alpha = \pi^*(\Omega|_{X\cap Y})$ in $\mathcal{M}$.

Pick a smooth function $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ such that for some small $0 \leq \epsilon_1 \leq \epsilon_2$,

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in B_{\epsilon_1}(X \cap Y) \\ 1 & \text{if } x \notin B_{\epsilon_2}(X \cap Y) \\ & \text{smoothly interpolates on } B_{\epsilon_2} \backslash B_{\epsilon_1} \end{cases}$$

consider the 2-form on $\mathcal{M}$:

$$F_\alpha = \pi^*(\Omega|_{X\cap Y}) + d(f \cdot \beta)$$

which extends naturally to all of X. Notice that $[F_\alpha] = [\pi^*(\Omega|_{X\cap Y})] = [\Omega] \in H_{dR}(X)$, therefore one can choose a connection α_X on NX with curvature F_α. Moreover if we assume (up to changing Ω in the same class) that $\Omega|_{X\cap Y}$ is the curvature of $\hat{\alpha}_Y$, we can pick α_X so that $\alpha_X|_{\pi^{-1}(X\cap Y)} = \hat{\alpha}_Y$. Now let $\mathcal{N} = B_{\epsilon_1}(X \cap Y)$. □

In the case of two manifolds, this easily implies that one can find connections α_X, α_Y compatible respectively with Y, ψ_Y and X, ψ_X and also compatible with given $\hat{\alpha}_Y$, $\hat{\alpha}_X$.

The case of multiple submanifolds is somewhat more delicate so we solve it separately:

Lemma 8. *Let $\{X_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}, \{\psi_I^{I'}\}, \{\alpha_i\}$ be the data of a plumbing as in Definition 6. Then there exist connections $\{\beta_i\}$ such that, for all i, j, β_i is compatible with ψ_{ij}^i.*

Proof. Let $\#\mathcal{I} = n$. The result is best proven by induction on k, by building connections $\beta_I^{I'}$ on $N_{X_{I'}}X_I$ for $I' \subset I \subset \mathcal{I}$, $I = I' \cup \{i\}$ and $\#I = n - k$, such that $\beta_I^{I'}$ is compatible with $\psi_{I\cup\{j\}}^I$ for all $j \notin I$. For $k = n - 1$ this yields the result. For $k = 0$, there is no compatibility restriction so any choice of $\beta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{I}\backslash\{j\}}$ is good.

For the inductive step, assume $\beta_J^{J'}$ have been built for all J, J' with $\#J > n - k$. Let $I \subset \mathcal{I}$ be such that $\#I = n - k$ and let $I' = I\backslash\{i\}$. Following Lemma 7, pick a form Ω on $N_{X_{I'}}X_I$ such that for all $j \notin I$, let $J = I \cup \{j\}$, then $\Omega|_{N_{X_{I'\cup\{j\}}}X_J}$ is the curvature of $\beta_J^{I'\cup\{j\}}\ N_{X_{I'}}X_I|_{X_J} = N_{X_{I'\cup\{j\}}}X_J$. Pick a j and deform Ω as in Lemma 7, to get a 2-form which agrees with $(\psi_J^I)^*(\Omega|_{N_{X_{I'\cup\{j\}}}X_J})$ on a neighborhood of X_J. Now pick a different k (let $K = I \cup \{k\}$) and let's look at a neighborhood of $X_{J\cup K} = X_{I\cup\{j\}\cup\{k\}}$. By assumption we already know that

$$\Omega|_{N_{X_{I'\cup\{j\}}}X_J} = (\psi_{J\cup K}^K)^*(\Omega|_{N_{X_{I'\cup\{j\}\cup\{k\}}}X_{J\cup K}})$$

which implies that

$$(\psi_J^I)^*(\Omega|_{N_{X_{I'\cup\{j\}}}X_J}) = (\psi_J^I)^*(\psi_{J\cup K}^K)^*(\Omega|_{N_{X_{I'\cup\{j\}\cup\{k\}}}X_{J\cup K}}) = (\psi_K^I)^*(\Omega|_{N_{X_{I'\cup\{k\}}}X_K})$$

close to $X_{J\cup K}$. Therefore one can proceed one j at a time to deform Ω to a form that agrees with $(\psi_J^I)^*(\Omega|_{N_{X_{I'\cup\{j\}}}X_J})$ on a neighborhood of X_J for all j. Let this form be $F_{\beta_I^{I'}}$, then take any $\beta_I^{I'}$ which has curvature $F_{\beta_I^{I'}}$.

□

If the connections are good enough, then we can build the plumbing as a symplectic space thanks to the next lemma.

Lemma 9. *Let $\psi_X : (N_X(X\cap Y), \omega_{\hat{\alpha}_X}) \to (X, \omega_X)$, $\psi_Y : (N_Y(X\cap Y), \omega_{\hat{\alpha}_Y}) \to (Y, \omega_Y)$ be symplectic embeddings. If $X \perp^\omega Y$, and if α_X, α_Y are compatible with the data and each other as in Definition 7, the plumbing $N_M(X\cup Y)$ inherits a natural symplectic structure descending from (NX, ω_{α_X}), (NY, ω_{α_Y}), $(N(X\cap Y), \omega_{\hat{\alpha}_X\oplus\hat{\alpha}_Y})$.*

Proof. We need to check that ω_{α_X} and ω_{α_Y} agree with respect to $\sim$, therefore inducing a symplectic form on the quotient. Let's consider the embedding $\xi_X : N_M(X\cap Y) \to NX$ where $N_M(X\cap Y) = N_X(X\cap Y)\oplus N_Y(X\cap Y)$ comes with the connection $\hat{\alpha}_X\oplus\hat{\alpha}_Y$ and the induced symplectic form. Then showing that $\xi_X^*(\omega_{\alpha_X}) = \omega_{\hat{\alpha}_X\oplus\hat{\alpha}_Y}$ is enough to prove the statement. Recall that ρ_X, ρ_Y indicate the hamiltonian circle action on NX, NY respectively (and the corresponding induced action on $N(X\cap Y)$).

We are looking for $\xi_X^*(\omega_{\alpha_X}) = \xi_X^*(\pi^*(\omega_X) + \rho_X F_{\alpha_X} + \omega_{\mathbb{C}})$, to compare it to

$$\omega_{\hat{\alpha}_X\oplus\hat{\alpha}_Y} = \pi^*(\omega_{X\cap Y}) + \rho_Y F_{\hat{\alpha}_X} + \rho_X F_{\hat{\alpha}_Y} + \omega_F$$

(here ω_F is the symplectic structure on a fibre of $N(X\cap Y)$).

We already know that $\psi_X^*(\omega_X) = \pi^*(\omega_{X\cap Y}) + \rho_Y F_{\hat{\alpha}_X} + \omega_{\mathbb{C}}$

from which we get $\xi_X^*(\pi_X^*(\omega_X)) = \psi_X^*(\omega_X) = \pi^*(\omega_{X\cap Y}) + \rho_Y F_{\hat{\alpha}_X} + \omega_{\mathbb{C},X}$ (here $\omega_{\mathbb{C},X}$ is the symplectic form on the fibres of $N(X\cap Y)$ in the direction of X).

Also it is easy to see that $\xi_X^*(\omega_{\mathbb{C}}) = \omega_{\mathbb{C},Y}$ (respectively the symplectic form on the vertical fibres of NX and the symplectic form on the fibres of $N(X\cap Y)$ in the direction orthogonal to X).

As for $\xi_X^*(\rho_X F_{\alpha_X})$, recall that it vanishes over $N_{X,z}(X\cap Y)$ by assumption, therefore $\rho_X F_{\alpha_X} = \rho_X F_{\alpha_X}|_{\pi^{-1}(X\cap Y)} \circ \pi_{\text{vert}}$ which also implies $\xi_X^*(\rho_X F_{\alpha_X}) = \rho_X F_{\hat{\alpha}_Y}$.

Therefore

$$\xi_X^*(\omega_{\alpha_X}) = \xi_X^*(\pi^*(\omega_X) + \rho_X F_{\alpha_X} + \omega_{\mathbb{C}}) =$$
$$\pi^*(\omega_{X\cap Y}) + \rho_Y F_{\hat{\alpha}_X} + \omega_{\mathbb{C},X} + \rho_X F_{\hat{\alpha}_Y} + \omega_{\mathbb{C},Y} = \omega_{\hat{\alpha}_X\oplus\hat{\alpha}_Y}.$$

Where the very last equality uses the fact that $X \perp^\omega Y$, therefore the symplectic structure on a fibre of $N(X\cap Y)$ is $\omega_F = \omega_{\mathbb{C},X} + \omega_{\mathbb{C},Y}$. □

Finally, let's put together all the lemmas.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\{X_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ be a finite set of symplectic submanifolds of (M,ω) such that all intersections are orthogonal. Then there exists a symplectic choice of plumbing data which also induces a symplectic form $\omega_{\mathcal{I}}$ on the plumbing $N(\bigcup_i X_i)$.*

Proof. First of all the symplectic form ω induces orthogonal splittings of the tangent bundle along any X_i, which in turn induces standard maps $g_i : NX_i \to TM|_{X_i}$, $g_i(v) = w$ where $\pi(w) = v$ and $w \perp^\omega TX_i$.

Also we can chose connections α_i on NX_i and use $\{\alpha_i, g_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ to build a plumbing as in Theorem 4.2.

Thanks to Lemma 8 we can find connections β_i which are compatible with the plumbing maps $\{\psi_{ij}^i\}_i$.

Each β_i induces a symplectic structure (close to the zero section) ω_i on the symplectic vector bundle NX_i. Theorem 5.1 guarantees that ω_i, ω_j agree with respect to the gluing map close to X_{ij} for all i, j. So all the ω_i's descend to a symplectic form $\omega_{\mathcal{I}}$ on the quotient $N(\bigcup_i X_i)$.

□

6. Symplectic neighborhoods of orthogonal submanifolds

Theorem 6.1 (Neighborhood theorem for orthogonal divisors). *Let $\{X_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ be a finite collection of codimension 2 symplectic submanifolds of (M,ω), and assume their intersection to be ω-orthogonal. Then*

- *it is possible to build a plumbing $N(\bigcup_i X_i)$;*
- *such plumbing inherits a symplectic form $\omega_{\mathcal{I}}$;*
- *there is a neighborhood of $\bigcup_i X_i$ in (M,ω) symplectomorphic to a neighborhood of $\bigcup_i X_i$ in $(N(\bigcup_i X_i),\omega_{\mathcal{I}})$ (relative to $\bigcup_i X_i$).*

Proof. The first two facts are the content of Theorem 5.1. So let's consider $(N(\bigcup_i X_i),\omega_{\mathcal{I}})$.

According to Proposition 4.1, there is an embedding $F : N(\bigcup_i X_i) \to M$ such that $F|_{\bigcup_i X_i} = id$ and F is induced by maps $F^i : NX_i \to M$ such that $d_{X_i}F^i = (g_i, id)$ (where g_i is induced by ω as in the proof of Theorem 5.1).

Let's consider the pullback form $F^*(\omega)$ on $N(\bigcup_i X_i)$. We can look at each NX_i separately and observe that $(F^i)^*(\omega) = \omega_i$ by construction (ω_i on NX_i is exactly the pushforward on NX_i of ω on $TM|_{X_i}$ by projection).

Therefore $F^*(\omega) = \omega_{\mathcal{I}}$ along all of $\bigcup_i X_i$. This means the hypotheses of Lemma 1 are satisfied. Therefore there exists a diffeomorphism $\phi : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{V}$ of two neighborhoods of $\bigcup_i X_i$ inside the plumbing, such that $\phi|_{\bigcup_i X_i} = id$ and $\phi^*(F^*(\omega)) = \omega_{\mathcal{I}}$.

The final result follows by considering

$$\varphi = F \circ \phi : N_M(\bigcup_i X_i) \to M$$

since $\varphi^*(\omega) = (F\circ\phi)^*(\omega) = \phi^* \circ F^*(\omega) = \omega_{\mathcal{I}}$. □

Corollary 6.1. *Let $\{X_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ be a finite family of orthogonal symplectic divisors in (M,ω). Then there exist connections α_i on NX_i and symplectic neighborhood embeddings*

$$\phi_i : (NX_i, \omega_{\alpha_i}) \to (M,\omega)$$

which are pairwise compatible. This means that there are symplectic neighborhood embeddings

$$\phi_{ij} : (NX_{ij}, \omega_{\alpha_i+\alpha_j}) \to (M,\omega)$$

which factor as $\phi_{ij} = \phi_i \circ \xi^i_{ij} = \phi_j \circ \xi^j_{ij}$, where $\xi^i_{ij} : NX_{ij} \cong NX_i \oplus NX_j \to NX_i$ and $\xi^j_{ij} : NX_{ij} \cong NX_i \oplus NX_j \to NX_j$ are bundle isomorphisms.

Proof. This is just a rephrasing of Theorem 6.1: the functions ϕ_i are the restriction of $\varphi : (N_M(\bigcup_i X_i),\omega_{\mathcal{I}}) \to (M,\omega)$ to each $NX_i \subset N_M(\bigcup_i X_i)$. The compatibility follows from the fact that such ϕ_i glue to a function on the plumbing. In particular one can construct $\phi_{ij} := \phi_i \circ (\psi^i_{ij})_*$ where $(\psi^i_{ij})_*$ is defined in the previous discussion as a bundle isomorphism. So just let $\xi^i_{ij} := (\psi^i_{ij})_*, \xi^j_{ij} := (\psi^j_{ij})_*$. □

7. G-equivariant formulation

In this section we first assume that G is a compact Lie group acting on M, in order to show that the plumbing construction can be carried out equivariantly. Afterwards we will assume that (M,ω) is symplectic and that G acts by symplectomorphisms (not necessarily hamiltonian); we will show that then the symplectic construction can be carried out equivariantly.

7.1. **The case of one submanifold.** First of all let's review what happens in the standard case of one submanifold $X \subset M$.

Theorem 7.1 (G-equivariant tubular neighborhood)**.** *Let $X \subset M$ be a submanifold preserved by the G-action. Consider the linearized action $G \circlearrowright NX$. There is a G-equivariant diffeomorphism $\phi : NX \to M$, defined close to the 0-section.*

Proof. Usually one would consider any metric λ and construct the corresponding exponential map. For the exponential map to be G-equivariant we need a G-invariant metric. To construct one, take any metric λ and consider $\tilde{\lambda}(v,w) = \int_G \lambda(g\cdot v, g\cdot w)dg$ where dg is given by any measure on the group G, invariant by left translation (e.g. it can be the Haar measure). Let's check that $\tilde{\lambda}$ is G-invariant: $\tilde{\lambda}(h\cdot v), h\cdot w) = \int_G \lambda(h\cdot g\cdot v), h\cdot g\cdot w)d\nu = \int_G \lambda(g\cdot v, g\cdot w)dg = \tilde{\lambda}(v,w)$. Let's check that the correspondent exponential map is then G-equivariant: the key is that if $\tilde{\lambda}$ is G-invariant, then G maps geodesics to geodesics. For $x \in X$, $v \in N_xX$, the point $exp(g\cdot x, g\cdot v)$ is given by flowing along a geodesic starting from $g\cdot x$ in the direction of $g\cdot v$ for time $|g\cdot v| = |v|$, which is the same as taking the geodesic at x in the direction of v, then traslating it by the element g. Therefore, $exp(g\cdot x, g\cdot v) = g\cdot exp(x,v)$. □

Once we put back the symplectic form, we get that:

Theorem 7.2 (G-equivariant symplectic tubular neighborhood)**.** *Let $X \subset (M,\omega)$ be a symplectic submanifold preserved by a symplectic G-action. Consider the linearized action $G \circlearrowright NX$. There is a G-equivariant symplectomorphism $\phi : NX \to M$, defined close to the 0-section. The derivative of ϕ along X is the identity.*

For which we need the following theorem.

Theorem 7.3 (equivariant symplectic neighborhood theorem)**.** *Given a compact Lie group G acting hamiltonially on the symplectic manifolds Y, X_1, X_2, and given equivariant symplectic embeddings $\iota_1 : Y \to X_1$, $\iota_2 : Y \to X_2$ plus a G-equivariant isomorphism $\phi : N_{X_1}Y \to N_{X_2}Y$ of symplectic normal bundles, there exists a G-equivariant symplectomorphism $\varphi : X_1 \to X_2$ close to Y such that*

$$\varphi \circ \iota_1 = \iota_2 \text{ and } d_{\iota_1(Y)}\varphi = \phi.$$

The proof of Theorem 7.3 is mostly based on Moser's argument:

Lemma 10 (Equivariant Moser's argument)**.** *Let ω_0, ω_1 be symplectic forms on X, connected by a path of symplectic forms of fixed deRham class. Let there be an action $G \circlearrowright X$, hamiltonian with respect to both symplectic forms (and all along the path). Assume that there exists a smooth family $\{\sigma_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ of 1-forms such that $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\omega_t = \sigma_t$, and each σ_t is G-equivariant. Then there exists a G-equivariant $\psi : X \to X$ such that $\psi^*(\omega_1) = \omega_0$.*

Proof. Follow the standard proof of Moser's argument (for the non-equivariant case) and notice that since all ω_t,σ_t are G-equivariant then so is the vector field X_t generating ω_t, and similarly so is the flow of X_t and so is ψ. □

Proof of Theorem 7.3. Recall that if $G \circlearrowright X_1$ and Y is a G-invariant embedding, then there is an induced action

$$G \circlearrowright NY \text{ s.t. } g(y,v) = (g\cdot y, D_y g(v)).$$

Find a G-invariant metric on X_1, by averaging just like in the proof of Theorem 7.1. The corresponding exponential map $exp_1 : NY \to X_1$ is then G-equivariant.

Now assume that $\phi : N_{X_1}Y \to N_{X_2}Y$ is equivariant, i.e. it satisfies

$$g(y, \phi_y(v)) = (y, D_y g_2(\phi_y(v))) = (y, D_y g_1(v)) \forall g \in G, (y, v) \in N_{X_1}Y$$

where g_1, g_2 indicate the action of g on X_1, X_2.

Consider $\tilde{\varphi} = exp_2 \circ \phi \circ exp_1^{-1} : X_1 \to X_2$ which is an equivariant diffeomorphism and a symplectomorphism because all three maps are. Then ω_1 and $\tilde{\varphi}^*(\omega_2)$ are two symplectic forms agreeing along Y and we can apply Lemma 10 to find $\psi : X_1 \to X_1$ such that $\psi^*\tilde{\varphi}^*(\omega_2) = \omega_1$ so $\varphi = \tilde{\varphi} \circ \psi$ is the map we need. □

Now we can prove Theorem 7.2.

Proof of Theorem 7.2. First of all we need a G-invariant metric $\tilde{\lambda}$ which is compatible with ω at all points of X. As for the proof of Theorem 7.1 we can construct $\tilde{\lambda}$ by first considering any metric λ compatible with ω, then averaging: $\tilde{\lambda}(v, w) = \int_G \lambda(g \cdot v, g \cdot w) dg$. Because G acts symplectically, $\tilde{\lambda}$ is still compatible with ω. Then the exponential map $exp : NX \to M$ is equivariant and $exp^*(\omega) = \omega$ along X. Consider any connection α on NX and the induced symplectic form ω_α. Since $exp^*(\omega) = \omega_\alpha$ along X, we are in the setup of Theorem 7.3 and we can find a G-equivariant symplectomorphism $\phi : NX \to NX$ such that $\phi^*(exp^*(\omega)) = \omega_\alpha$. Then $exp \circ \phi : NX \to M$ is as desired. □

7.2. **Equivariant plumbing.** Let's show how to construct plumbings sensibly in the presence of a group action.

Proposition 7.4 (Equivariant plumbing)**.** *Let G be a compact Lie group acting on M. Let $\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ be a finite collection of transverse, G-invariant submanifolds. Then there exist:*

- ◇ *equivariant plumbing maps $\psi_I^{I'} : N_{X_{I'}} X_I \to X_{I'}$ for $I \subset I'$;*
- ◇ *connections α_i on NX_i;*
- ◇ *a natural G-action on the plumbing;*
- ◇ *a G-equivariant embedding $\phi : N(\bigcup_i X_i) \to M$.*

Let's first prove a lemma.

Lemma 11. *Assume the data of equivariant plumbing maps $\psi_I^{I'} : N_{X_{I'}} X_I \to X_{I'}$ for $I' \subset I$ (as in Definition 6). Then there exist connections α_i on NX_i such that the corresponding plumbing naturally inherits a G-action.*

Proof. Consider the G-action on NX_i obtained by linearizing the one on M. Let G_i be the subgroup that fixes all points of X_i and consider its linearized action on a fibre: $G_i \circlearrowright N_x X_i$. In particular such G_i action is (when choosing an appropriate hermitian structure on NX_i) hermitian, so that $G_i \to Sp(k) \cap U(k)$ (where $k = \dim X_i$). Let $\tilde{G}_i = Im(G_i) \subset Sp(k) \cap U(k)$. Then NX_i is the associated bundle of a principal $\tilde{G}_i$-bundle, $\mathcal{U}$. Now we can choose a connection $\tilde{\alpha}$ on $\mathcal{U}$ and in particular end up with a G_i-invariant hermitian connection α on NX_i. This is important because it implies that parallel transport maps are equivariant.

Consider the plumbing of $\bigcup_i X_i$ given by such G_i-invariant connections α_i. We can check that the G-actions on NX_i for all i now descend to a G-action on the plumbing. For convenience, we refer to the construction of plumbing as described in Definition 5. Without loss of generality we will show that $\xi_i : NX_{ij} \to NX_i$ is equivariant. What

follows is that $\xi_j \circ \xi_i^{-1} : NX_i \to NX_j$ is also equivariant, therefore the G-actions agree with respect to the plumbing maps. To show that $\xi_i : NX_{ij} \to NX_i$ is equivariant, let's write it out: $\xi_i(z, v_j, v_i) = (\psi_{ij}^i(z, v_j), \Gamma_\alpha v_i)$ for $z \in X_{ij}, v_j \in N_{X_i}X_{ij} = NX_j, v_i \in N_{X_j}X_{ij} = NX_i$. It is important that, because of the plumbing data sending $N_{X_i}X_{ij} \to X_i$ and $N_{X_j}X_{ij} \to X_j$, which are invariant under G, then we know that $Dg(v_i)$ is still in NX_i, and the linearized action of g inside NX_{ij} and NX_i are the same when applied to v_i. We get

$$\xi_i \circ g(z, v_j, v_i) = \xi_i(gz, Dg(v_j), v_i) = (\psi_{ij}^i(gz, Dg(v_j)), \Gamma_\alpha Dg(v_i))$$

and, because we are assuming that ψ_{ij}^i is equivariant,

$$(\psi_{ij}^i(gz, Dg(v_j)), \Gamma_\alpha Dg(v_i)) = (g \cdot \psi_{ij}^i(z, v_j), \Gamma_\alpha Dg(v_i))$$

and, because parallel transport is equivariant, we finally get

$$\xi_i \circ g(z, v_j, v_i) = (g \cdot \psi_{ij}^i(z, v_j), Dg(\Gamma_\alpha v_i)) = g \circ \xi_i(z, v_j, v_i).$$

□

Proof of Proposition 7.4. All we need to do is go through the proof of Theorem 4.2 and check that the arguments can be used in the G-equivariant case. We can find the connections α_i just as explained in the previous lemma. If we assume equivariant plumbing data for the inductive step, we can construct a plumbing which, as in the previous, has a G-action.

Now let's go through the steps of Proposition 4.1 to see what happens. In step 1, there is a choice of metric. In the equivariant setting, such metric has to be invariant. This isn't a problem since one can check that averaging along G doesn't change the required properties (in particular, if all X_i's are geodesic and orthogonal with respect to λ, they still are with respect to $\tilde{\lambda}$ because G preserves all the strata). In the second step, again the metrics g_i, g_j can be averaged along G without creating problems; moreover the metric g obtained as a linear combination is still invariant at X_{ij} (note that we are pulling back with respect to ψ_{ij}^i which is assumed equivariant). Translating along Γ_{α_i} is also not a problem since we know that Γ_{α_i} is equivariant. To summarize, we still get an invariant metric $\nu^* g$. Therefore the corresponding exponential maps and derivatives thereof are all equivariant with respect to G. All the maps in Step 3,4,5 are equivariant because they are compositions of equivariant maps. In Step 6, we are introducing a new exponential map $h^i : NX_i \to M$. Guess what! We just have to make h^i equivariant by choosing an invariant metric. This guarantees that F^i is equivariant and we're done.

□

7.3. **Equivariant symplectic neighborhood of multiple submanifolds.** We finally get to the equivariant version of Theorem 6.1.

First we need the equivariant version of Lemma 1.

Lemma 12. *Let ω_1, ω_2 be symplectic forms on M that agree along a collection of codimension 2, transversely intersecting symplectic submanifolds X_i. Let there be an action $G \circlearrowright M$ preserving each X_i. Then there exist open neighborhoods $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$ of $\bigcup_i X_i$ and a G-equivariant symplectomorphism $\phi : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{V}$ such that*

$$\phi|_{\bigcup_i X_i} = id \text{ and } \phi^*(\omega_2) = \omega_1$$

Proof. Follow the proof of the non-equivariant case (Lemma 1), but observe that at each step of the induction the construction of σ_k is based on a choice of exponential map. As in the proof of Theorem 7.3, we construct (by averaging) a G-equivariant metric g. Therefore the corresponding map exp_k is g-equivariant, therefore so is the map ϕ_t for any t, therefore so is σ_t for any t, therefore so is σ_k. This means all the $\omega^{(k)}$ are G-equivariant (meaning that G acts symplectically with respect to each $\omega^{(k)}$), and all functions f_k are also G-equivariant. So in the end, ϕ is equivariant. □

Finally we are able to construct an equivariant symplectic plumbing, and equivariantly embed it into (M, ω).

Theorem 7.5 (Equivariant symplectic plumbing)**.** *Let G be a compact Lie group acting on (M, ω) via symplectomorphisms. Let $\{X_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ be a finite collection of transverse, G-invariant submanifolds. Then there exist:*

- ◇ *connections α_i on NX_i;*
- ◇ *equivariant plumbing symplectomorphisms $\psi_I^{I'} : N_{X_{I'}} X_I \to X_{I'}$ for $I \subset I'$ (relative to the symplectic forms induced by α_i);*
- ◇ *a natural symplectic G-action on the plumbing;*
- ◇ *a G-equivariant symplectic embedding $\phi : N(\bigcup_i X_i) \to M$.*

Proof. We need to merge Proposition 7.4 and Theorem 5.1. The main issue is to check that the conditions on the connections relative to equivariant plumbing and symplectic plumbing do not interfere. The reason they don't is the following: construct the α_i's as in Lemma 11. When constructing them, we look at connections $\tilde{\alpha}$ on NX_i seen as a G_i-bundle. Such $\tilde{\alpha}_i$'s are chosen arbitrarily, so we can make sure that they satisfy the compatibility conditions as in Definition 7, which we can do for the same reason as in Lemmas 7,8. Then the α_i's corresponding to such $\tilde{\alpha}_i$'s also satisfy the right compatibility conditions.

The rest of the arguments merge smoothly: by following the construction in Theorems 5.1,6.1 while keeping all the underlying maps G-equivariant we get the result! □

Appendix A. An extension to positive intersection

Let's consider the case of positively intersecting divisors (that is, not orthogonal). The theorems can be adapted to still obtain canonical local coordinates. This can be done by changing the symplectic form linearly, close to the intersections on the plumbing. The construction would require a few more technical steps. A sketch is as following:

- ◇ Construct the plumbing and produce a symplectic form on the plumbing, such that the intersection of the divisors is orthogonal;
- ◇ Change the symplectic form on the plumbing: close to the intersection of X_i, X_j, define a new form such that the angle between X_i, X_j is as wanted;
- ◇ Proposition 4.1 can still be applied to show that there exists an appropriate embedding of the plumbing, and Lemma 1 can be used to show that there must be a symplectomorphism.

On the other hand, we can at least recover some results up to deformation, without actually describing the local model for positive intersections.

A theorem of R. Gompf [REG93] states that positive intersections of symplectic manifolds can be deformed to orthogonal. We can use a version of it for multiple intersection:

Proposition A.1. *If a collection of symplectic submanifolds intersect positively, then there is an isotopy, supported close to the intersection, deforming the symplectic submanifolds into orthogonally intersecting submanifolds.*

From this we can recover the following result, which was first proven in [TMZ14].

Corollary A.1 (of Theorem 6.1)**.** *Given a family $\{X_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ of symplectic submanifolds with positive intersection, ω can be deformed in a neighborhood of $\bigcup_i X_i$ in such a way that a neighborhood of $\bigcup_i X_i$ becomes symplectomorphic to $N_M(\bigcup_i X_i)$.*

Proof. The manifolds in the family $\{X_i\}_i$ in M can be isotoped, arbitrarily close to the intersections, to make them orthogonal; once they are orthogonal, Theorem 6.1 applies and we can find a neighborhood $\mathcal{N}$ symplectomorphic to a plumbing. The isotopy of $\bigcup_i X_i$ locally extends to an ambient isotopy, which can be thought of as a deformation of the symplectic structure instead: let $\Phi : M \times [0,1] \to M$ be the isotopy from $\bigcup_i X_i$ to orthogonal $\bigcup_i Y_i$, and let $\omega^{(t)}$ be $\Phi_t^*(\omega)$. Then we have the result (because $\Phi_1^*(\mathcal{N})$ is the neighborhood we look for with respect to $\omega^{(1)}$). □

Remark. The result of this corollary is intrinsically different from the theorem: the corollary is also true for a metric (a metric can be modified close to an intersection to have a standard model), while the theorem is not (a metric does not always admit a standard model, since the curvature is invariant under isometries). This is the same observation that one makes when noting that Darboux coordinates can always be found for a symplectic form, while there is no analogue for a metric.

REFERENCES

[GS08] M. Gross and B. Siebert. An invitation to toric degenerations. arXiv:0808.2749v2, 2008.

[Gua16] R. Guadagni. Lagrangian torus fibrations and toric degenerations. In preparation, 2016.

[MS98] D. McDuff and D. Salamon. *Introduction to Symplectic Topology*. Oxford mathematical monographs. Clarendon Press, 1998.

[REG93] Tomasz S. Mrowka Robert E. Gompf. Irreducible 4-manifolds need not be complex. *Annals of Mathematics*, 138(1):61–111, 1993.

[TMZ14] M. Tehrani, M. McLean, and A. Zinger. A multifold symplectic sum construction. 2014. arXiv:1410.2573v1.

[Wei71] A. Weinstein. Symplectic manifolds and their lagrangian submanifolds. *Advances in Mathematics*, 6, 1971. doi:10.1016/0001-8708(71)90020-X.